

## **REMARKS**

In view of the above amendments and the following remarks, reconsideration and further examination are respectfully requested.

### **I. Amendments to the Claims**

Claims 1 and 20 have been amended to further distinguish the invention recited therein from the references identified in the rejections discussed below. Dependent claim 4 has been amended to remain consistent with amended independent claim 1.

### **II. 35 U.S.C. §103(a) Rejections**

Claims 1, 4 and 6-20 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over the combination of Motamed et al. (U.S. 7,081,969), Stephens et al. (U.S. 2003/0095524) and Salgado et al. (U.S. 2002/0067504). These rejections are believed clearly inapplicable to amended independent claims 1 and 20 and claims 4 and 6-19 that depend therefrom for the following reasons.

Amended independent claim 1 recites an apparatus including a storing section for storing a piece of acquired service-specific information that contains information related to a combination of types of electronic apparatuses and related to an application for implementing a service on an electronic apparatus. Moreover, the apparatus of claim 1 includes (1) an update information acquiring section that, based on a piece of stored service-specific information, accesses a portal site to acquire update information regarding a service that corresponds to the stored piece of service-specific information. Further, the apparatus of claim 1 includes (2) an

update notification section for, when the acquired update information is related to an application, notifying every electronic apparatus, that corresponds to the application related to the update information, of the application. Furthermore, claim 1 recites that (3) when the acquired update information is not related to the application, the storage section updates the service-specific information stored thereon.

Initially, please note that the above-described 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) rejection acknowledges that Motamed and Stephens fail to disclose or suggest above-mentioned distinguishing features (1)-(3). In light of the above, this rejection relies on Salgado for disclosing the above-mentioned distinguishing features (1)-(3) which are admittedly lacking from Motamed and Stephens.

However, Salgado merely teaches that a driver itself is used to make an inquiry to the user asking whether or not the user wants to download and install a newer version of the driver once a newer version of the driver is found by the driver. Further, Salgado teaches that the driver simply notifies the user that the new version of the driver has been downloaded and/or installed (see paragraphs [0011] and [0024]).

In view of the above, it is evident that Salgado teaches notifying a user of a printer if an updated printer driver is available and/or has been downloaded, but still fails to disclose or suggest an update information acquiring section that, based on a piece of stored service-specific information (i.e., information that is related to a combination of type of electronic apparatuses and related to an application for implementing a service on an electronic apparatus), accesses a portal site to acquire update information regarding a service that corresponds to the stored piece of service-specific information, as required by claim 1.

Additionally, in view of the above, it is clear that, although Salgado teaches that if an

updated printer driver is available, the user is notified, Salgado still fails to disclose or suggest that, when the acquired update information is related to an application, notifying every electronic apparatus, that corresponds to the application related to the update information, of the application, and, when the acquired update information is not related to the application, the storage section updates the service-specific information stored thereon, as recited in claim 1.

Furthermore, it is also apparent that Salgado teaches that only the user of the printer is notified of an updated driver, but fails to disclose or suggest notifying every electronic apparatus of the system when the acquired updated information is related to the application, as required by claim 1.

Therefore, because of the above-mentioned distinctions it is believed clear that claim 1 and claims 4 and 6-19 that depend therefrom would not have been obvious or result from any combination of Motamed, Stephens and Salgado.

Furthermore, there is no disclosure or suggestion in Motamed, Stephens and Salgado or elsewhere in the prior art of record which would have caused a person of ordinary skill in the art to modify Motamed, Stephens and/or Salgado to obtain the invention of independent claim 1. Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that independent claim 1 and claims 4 and 6-19 that depend therefrom are clearly allowable over the prior art of record.

Independent claim 20 is directed to a method, and recites features that correspond to the above-mentioned distinguishing features of independent claim 1. Thus, for the same reasons discussed above, it is respectfully submitted that claim 20 is allowable over Motamed, Stephens and Salgado.

### **III. Conclusion**

In view of the above amendments and remarks, it is submitted that the present application is now in condition for allowance and an early notification thereof is earnestly requested. The Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned by telephone to resolve any remaining issues.

Respectfully submitted,

Takahiro WATANABE et al.

**/Andrew L. Dunlap/**

By: 2008.11.24 14:06:22 -05'00'

Andrew L. Dunlap

Registration No. 60,554

Attorney for Applicants

ALD/led  
Washington, D.C. 20006-1021  
Telephone (202) 721-8200  
Facsimile (202) 721-8250  
November 24, 2008